



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,951	01/15/2002	William Kress Bodin	AUS920010850US1	4423
34533	7590	07/13/2006		
INTERNATIONAL CORP (BLF) c/o BIGGERS & OHANIAN, LLP P.O. BOX 1469 AUSTIN, TX 78767-1469				EXAMINER PATEL, DHARYA A
				ART UNIT 2151 PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/046,951	BODIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dhairya A. Patel	2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication filed on 10/25/2005.
2. This amendment has been fully considered and entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1,4-6,9-11,14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mousseau et al. U.S. Patent # 6,438,585 (hereinafter Mousseau).

As per claim 1, Mousseau teaches a method of email administration comprising the steps of:

-receiving through a transcoding gateway (Fig. 6 element 210) an

email message (Fig 6 element 200), wherein the email message comprises at least one digital object having a digital object type (Fig.6 element 200, 200B) (column 15 lines 45-65);

The reference teaches receiving an datagram (email message) in the mobile device or the desktop system through the relay device (transcoding gateway) and the datagram (email message) containing an attachment (Fig. 6 element 200,200B).

-the transcoding gateway (Fig. 6 element 210) is coupled to one or more display devices (Fig. 6 element 216) (column 15 lines 27-36), and

The reference teaches relay device (gateway) is couple to mobile device, printer, fax, telephone, cellular phone (one or more display device).

-the transcoding gateway comprises, for each display device, a display device record comprising display format attributes of each display device, wherein the display format attributes include a display format type for each display device (column 16 lines 4-42);

The reference teaches having an attachment display devices (display device) and attachment display device sends the mobile device information on the type of attachment files they accept (display format attributes includes a display format type for each display device) in the database of the attachment displayers.

-finding a display device record for a destination display device, wherein the destination display device comprises a display device having a display format type that is the same as the digital object type (column 16 lines 4-42, lines 64-67)(column 17 lines 1-16);

-transcoding the digital object in dependence upon the display format attributes of the destination display device (column 16 lines 64-67)(column 17 lines 1-16); and

The reference teaches reconfiguring (transcoding) the attachment (digital object) is found in a compatible format as the attachment displayers (destination device), the attachment displayers views the attachment in the compatible format, if the attachment is not in a compatible format it is then converted to the suited format by the host system to one of attachment displayers.

-displaying the transcoded digital object on the destination display device (column 16 lines 64-67)(column 17 lines 1-16)(column 18 lines 31-38).

The reference teaches viewing the converted attachment (transcoded digital object) on the attachment display or the mobile phone (destination display device).

As per claim 4, Mousseau teaches the method of claim 1 wherein displaying the transcoded digital object on the destination display device further comprises writing the transcoded digital object to display memory (column 18 lines 34-38).

The reference teaches sending or pushing (writing) the converted attachment to the mobile device which inherently contains memory (display memory).

As per claim 5, Mousseau teaches the method of claim 1 wherein displaying the transcoded digital object on the destination display device further comprises sending the transcoded digital object to a browser (column 18 lines 34-38) (column 4 lines 58-67)(column 5 lines 1-11).

The reference teaches sending the converted attachment to the mobile device, which contains a browser because mobile device is used to view web pages (i.e. browser) (column 5 lines 1-11).

As per claim 6,9-10 respectively, teaches same limitation as claims 1,4-5 respectively, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claim 11,14-15 respectively, teaches same limitation as claims 1,4-5 respectively, therefore rejected under same basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-3,7-8,12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mousseau et al. U.S. Patent # 6,438,585 (hereinafter Mousseau) in view of Malik et al U.S. Patent # 6,907,452 (hereinafter Malik).

As per claim 2, Mousseau teaches the method of claim 1, transcoding gateway (Fig. 6 element 210) but fails to teach the gateway comprises an email client, a web browser, and an HTTP server. Malik teaches gateway comprises an email client, a web browser and an HTTP server (Fig. 7)(Fig. 8) (column 6 lines 55-67)(column 7 lines 1-14). Malik teaches an HTTP server, an web server (which is going to include a web browser) and a post office server (email client) because post office server is in charge of transmitting the email (Fig. 7)(Fig. 8)(column 6 lines 55-67)(column 7 lines 1-14). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Malik's teaching in Mousseau's teaching to come up with having an gateway with an e-mail client, HTTP server and a web browser. The motivation for doing so would having been so that when the gateway receives the email it can view the email using the browser or it could act as an email to transmit or forward the email to the other email client.

As per claim 3, Mousseau teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the client device (Fig. 6 element 214B) comprises a display device (Fig. 6 element 214B) and a microcomputer (Fig. 6 element 214B).

Mousseau teaches a mobile device (client device) which is comprises a display device (Fig. 6 element 216) or the mobile device is going to have a display to view the attachment and an microcomputer because all the mobile devices contain processors (microcomputer).

Mousseau fails to teaches wherein the microcomputer further comprises the transcoding gateway, an email client, a web browser, and an HTTP server, wherein the transcoding gateway, the email client, the web browser, and the HTTP server are coupled for data communications. Malik teaches microcomputer comprises the gateway, an email client, a web browser and an HTTP server where they gateway, email client ,and the web browser and the HTTP server are coupled for data communication (Fig. 7)(Fig. 8)(column 6 lines 55-67)(column 7 lines 1-14).

Malik on the other hand teaches a microcomputer with an gateway, an HTTP server, an web server (which is going to include a web browser) and a post office server

(email client) because post office server is in charge of transmitting the email and all are coupled for data communications (Fig. 7)(Fig. 8)(column 6 lines 55-67)(column 7 lines 1-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Malik's teaching in Mousseau's teaching to come up with having a microcomputer with an gateway with an e-mail client, HTTP server and a web browser. The motivation for doing so would have been so that when the gateway receives the email it can view the email using the browser or it could act as an email to transmit or forward the email to the other email client..

As per claim 7-8 respectively, teaches same limitation as claims 2-3 respectively, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claim 12-13 respectively, teaches same limitation as claims 2-3 respectively, therefore rejected under same basis.

Remarks

As per remarks, Applicant stated for following:

- A). Applicant stated Mousseau does not disclose receiving through a transcoding gateway an email message.
- B). Applicant stated Mousseau does not disclose finding a display device record for a destination display device, wherein the destination display device comprises a display device having a display format type that is the same as the digital object type.
- C). Applicant stated Mousseau does not disclose transcoding the digital object in dependence upon the display format attributes of the destination display device.

D). Applicant stated Mousseau does not disclose displaying the transcoded digital object on the destination display device.

As per remark A, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because in column 15 lines 45-65, Mousseau teaches receiving an datagram (email message) in the mobile device or the desktop system through the relay device (transcoding gateway) and the datagram (email message) containing an attachment (Fig. 6 element 200,200B). As applicant stated, "transcoding gateway" is a server capable of transcoding messages from one format to another. Mousseau teach in column 15 lines 57-65, the attachments formats are automatically changed from one format to another for viewing on the mobile device therefore, it relay device can be interpreted as a transcoding gateway.

As per remark B, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because in column 16 lines 4-42, lines 64-67, column 17 lines 1-16, Mousseau teaches mobile device trying to find a display device and querying them and then attachment displayers sending back information to the mobile regarding the attachment files they can handle (display device record for destination display device), and the mobile device having list of potential attachment displayers with their information on what type of attachment they can handle (destination display device comprises a display device having a display format type that is same as digital object type). In column 17 lines 1-16, Mousseau teaches if compatible attachment display is found to forward the processing of the attachment compatible with the display.

As per remark C, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because in column 16 lines 64-67, column 17 lines 1-16, Mousseau teaches reconfiguring (transcoding) the attachment (digital object) is found in a compatible format as the attachment displayers (destination device), the attachment displayers views the attachment in the compatible format, if the attachment is not in a compatible format it is then converted to the suited format by the host system to one of attachment displayers. Applicant stated that "display format attributes are included in the transcoded gateway" and "transcoding the digital object in dependence upon the display format attributes of the destination display device". Examiner would like to point out that in column 16 lines 64-67 and column 17 lines 1-16, Mousseau teaches host determines whether the attachment is compatible format for the attachment displayers and if it is not compatible then it is converted to the suitable format for one of those discovered displayers which means that display format attributes are included in the host system/relay device because it can convert the format suitable for other displayers which means transcoding the attachment (digital object) in dependence upon converting the format according to the attachment displayers (dependence upon the display format attributes of the destination device), therefore mousseau reads on the claimed limitations.

As per remark D, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because column 16 lines 64-67, column 17 lines 1-16, column 18 lines 31-38, Mousseau teaches viewing the converted attachment (transcoded digital object) on the attachment display or the mobile phone (destination display device). Applicant stated that Mousseau never once mentions "displaying the transcoded digital object on the

destination display device, but Examiner would like to point out that in column 17, Mousseau states once the attachment is converted into a suitable format by the host system for displaying, therefore it is displayed.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - A). "Rerouting/reformatting wireless messages for cross connectivity between service providers" by Moran et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2003/0104827.
6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dhairy A. Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-

5809. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00AM-4:30PM, first Fridays OFF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DAP


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER